

***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments filed 9/29/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

2. **APPLICANT'S ARGUMENTS:**

1) *"The Advisory Action concedes that Kayanakis does not specifically teach an embodiment in which the antenna is placed outside of the article .....the Advisory Action continues to fail to provide any clear rationale beyond mere unsubstantiated, conclusory statements";*

2) *"The Advisory Action asserts that to state that It would not have been possible is purely speculative on the applicant's part, since the prior art of record does not specifically teach against this possibility.....Therefore, there is no suggestion or motivation to make the proposed modification and the teachings of the references are not sufficient to render the claims prima facie obvious."*

3. **EXAMINER'S RESPONSE:**

1-2) Applicant argues that in a prima facie case of obviousness, it is not whether the prior art does not preclude a hypothetical modification, but rather why one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention would have had sufficient reasons to necessarily make the proposed modification. As well, applicant argues that the neither the Advisory Action or the previous Official Actions provide any clear rationale supporting a case of obviousness with regards to the antenna being mounted on a surface of the article. However, in review of examiner's Office Action dated 10/30/2006, the examiner provided reasoning as to why one of ordinary skill would have

made the modification to Kayanakis. The examiner's reasoning stated that: *"Since Kayanakis teaches the module being located in a through hole as seen in figure 2, It would have been obvious that the antenna or circuit would have been readily mounted on or inside the paper, as desired, since one of ordinary skill would have readily mounted the module based on the position of the module relative to the hole."* The applicant may not agree with the examiner's reasoning, however, sufficient reasoning was provided with regards to the rejection of this limitation. In view of this, the applicant's argument is not deemed persuasive.

Furthermore, the examiner's so called, "conclusory statements" were only in response to applicant's accusations that it would not have been obvious to provide a thin film transistor having a semiconductor film thickness of 0.2 micrometers or less. Minimizing the thickness of the film would not have been deemed a patentable feature. It is well known that reduction in size or dimensions of articles is a well known concept in any field of endeavor, since it would have provided an inherent benefit of, at least, saving space. So, just because the examiner has not found a reference that recites a feature which specifically states a thickness of 0.2 micrometers or less, does not wholly preclude a rejection of that limitation in the present invention. Taken in context of the field of endeavor, reduction of size of semiconductor film has been a reasonable expectation during the advancement of successive generations of semiconductor film. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have readily recognized the advantage of making the film as thin as it could possibly be, while still allowing it to be functional. Unless the applicant can point out some unexpected

Art Unit: 2612

advantage, that the present invention provides, by making the film 0.2 micrometers or less, the examiner does not deem this limitation patentable.

In view of this, applicant's arguments are not deemed persuasive.

As well, the examiner has included a signed acknowledgement of the Information Disclosure Statement filed on August 21, 2006.

### ***Conclusion***

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DARYL POPE whose telephone number is (571)272-2959. The examiner can normally be reached on 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, MIKE RAZAVI can be reached on 571-272-7664. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/DARYL POPE/

DARYL POPE

Application/Control Number: 10/586,049

Page 5

Art Unit: 2612

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2612

Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2612